The State University of New York has been supportive of the competence-based teacher education (CBTE) movement, and we believe this type of teacher education program should be encouraged. However, in response to questions from some of the campuses, SUNY Central Administration recently sought clarification of The State Education Department's stance on this issue from Deputy Commissioner Nolan. A copy of that correspondence is attached.

The State Education Department's policy does not require that programs be designed in the competence-based mode, and it seems appropriate that SUNY's policy conform to that of the Department. It is not necessary for proposals for new programs in teacher education to incorporate the CBTE principles unless the campus wishes to do so. You will note that Deputy Commissioner Nolan calls attention to Sections 52.21(1) and (2) of the Commissioner's Regulations which require that program objectives be stated in "observable behavioral terms" and that programs include a procedure for continuous evaluation of the program.

When a campus makes revisions in existing programs, including conversion to a mode other than CBTE, a copy of such revisions should be sent to my office which will transmit them to The State Education Department. As a result, both my office and The State Education Department will be aware of the manner in which campus programs are currently being conducted.

If you have any questions about this change in policy, please let me know.
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Dear Jerry:

Thank you for your letter of June 30, 1982 in which you requested clarification concerning the Department's position on Competence-Based Teacher Education (CBTE) programs. Let me respond to the three questions you raised in the order in which you presented them:

1. There is no Regulation that requires institutions to submit teacher preparation programs in the CBTE format. Campuses may choose to follow that format if they wish, as long as they submit all of the information called for in Appendix A of CEO No. 3 (dated January 15, 1976).

2. When Department staff evaluate programs, we do so in relation to Part 52 of the Regulations. Continuation of the CBTE approach is not required by those Regulations and therefore would not be a basis for criticism. Teacher education programs are judged in accordance with their compliance with Sections 52.2 and 52.21 of Regulations. With respect to the assessment of competence of prospective teachers, I call your attention to two provisions. The first, found in 52.21(1) under "Purposes" states: "For each program there should be clear statements of the objectives in observable behavioral terms and the procedure that is to be followed for the continuous evaluation of the program." The second, found in 52.21(2) under "Resources" states: "The adequacy of the resources shall be judged by evidence showing how the graduates will meet the objectives of the program."

Relating back to your question, if a college elects to convert a competence-based program to some other mode, that change is a significant one which must be brought to our attention in advance.

3. The only recent written analysis of the results of the conversion of teacher education programs in the State to the CBTE format was the report made to the Regents at their June 1982 meeting.
I hope that this information will be helpful to you and your colleagues. Please call me if you have other questions about these matters.

Sincerely,

Donald J. Nolan

cc: Thomas E. Sheldon
    Alvin P. Lierheiner
    John J. McGarraghy
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